<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-14, 17, 19-24, 33, and 34 were previously canceled. By this amendment, claim 15 was amended and claims 35-45 have been added. No claims were canceled. Accordingly, Claims 15, 16, 18, 25-32 and 35-45 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is earnestly requested. An early allowance is also requested considering the time this case has been pending before the USPTO.

In addition, the Applicant requests that the Examiner phone Applicant's attorney to discuss the case before picking up the case and further examining same.

It is further noted that the extension for the filing of the appeal is being paid to keep the case pending. The RCE is being filed as the case is pending.

35 U.S.C 112 Rejection

Claims 15-16, 18 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 15, line 2-4, that

"recites 'receiving medical data through a software module and parsing patient identification information and study information from the received medical data' is which is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention." (See page 2 of the Office Action mailed November 2, 2009)

According to the Examiner, paragraph [0039] is the only portion of the application that mentions parsing. The Examiner goes on to state the following:

"No where else in the specification is parsing patient identification information and study information from the received medical data is even mentioned or recited." (See page 23 of the Office Action mailed November 2, 2009)

It should be noted that the application is a non-provisional of Provisional Application No. 60/205,751, filed on May 19, 2000. Page 2 of the Provisional Application includes the FilmX DICOM Exchange Station connects to the existing DICOM network and

"receives the patients images from the source (modality, viewing station, or any DICOM Storage SCU). Images are then organized into DICOM exchange conformant files and directories. Patient and study demographics are extracted."(See page 2, paragraph 2 of provisional application 60/205,751)

Therefore, the provisional application makes it clear that the patient and study information is extracted from the image files.

Furthermore, the application does contain further teachings and disclosure of parsing or extracting of information from the medical information. The example discussed in the specification relates to a DICOM file. DICOM files are standardized. DICOM files and include images, and headers having datasets with information found at specific locations in the header. Attached to this response is a DICOMdump (Appendix A) showing header information and the DATASETs from the header information from a standardized DICOM file. The paragraphs following paragraph [0039] which discusses parsing, include the results of such parsing. For example, according to paragraph [0040] of the application,

"Patient differentiation is based on Patient Identification which consists of the concatenation of information found in DICOM datasets: **PatientsID** `_` **PatientsName**..." (see paragraph [0040] of the application).

PatientsID is found in data set (0010, 0020) in the DICOMdump and **PatientsName** is found in data set (0010, 0010) in the attached DICOMdump. These datasets are from the header of the DICOM file.

Similarly, paragraph [0041] discusses study identification. That paragraph states:

"Study identification is based on the **StudyInstanceUID**. Study Directory name beneath the Patient Directory is the study identification referenced above." (see paragraph [0041] of the application).

StudyInstanceUID is found in data set (0020, 000D) in the DICOMdump which is another dataset are from the header of the standardized DICOM file.

In addition, paragraphs [0044] - [0046] and paragraphs [0048] - [0051] are further datasets found in the header of a standardized DICOM file.

[0044]	**PatientsName**	(0010, 0010)
Paragraph Number	DATASET Name	DATASET Location
[0045]	**PatientsSex**	(0010, 0040)

[0046]	**PatientsBirthDate**	(0010, 0030)
[0048]	**StudyDate**	(0008, 0020)
[0049]	**StudyTime**	(0008, 0030)
[0050]	**StudyID**	(0008, 0130)
[0051]	**StudyDescription**	(0020, 0010)
[0052]	**RefferringPhysciansName**	(0008, 0090)
[0053]	**AccessionNumber**	(0008, 0050)

Parsing was mentioned in the paragraph [0039] preceding the above paragraphs. One of skill in the art would have knowledge of the standardized format associated with a DICOM file or could easily learn the standardized format and determine that these datasets are coming from the header of the DICOM file. As a result of the above, one skilled in the art who recognizes datasets found in the header of a standard DICOM file would recognize that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention or more specifically of parsing or extracting the datasets from the header of the DICOM file.

The Examiner also stated that the language of claim 15, lines 8-11 included language that was "...not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specific claim language the Examiner used to form his rejection was "...creating a job containing medical data, medical data image viewing software, and a print file for an autoloader control software, the print file having the stored parsed patient identification information and the stored parsed study information..."

As the Examiner is probably well aware, the specification includes not only the portion of the application labeled the specification but also includes all the sections of the application as originally filed. This includes the claims and the figures.

Claim 1 as originally filed is replicated below for the Examiner's convenience:

1. A data recording system comprising:
a computer for receiving information, including fields of identification data to identify the information received,
a means for dividing the received information into one or more identifiable files for a job,

a information recorder for storing the identifiable files of the job on a
data storage medium, and means for recording the information on the data
storage medium,

a means for selecting fields of identification data from the information
received, for printing on the data storage medium,

a ;printer for ;printing selected fields of identification data on the data
storage medium and for printing other matter such as logos on the data storage
medium,

a means for instructing the printer to print the selected identification data
and other matter on the data storage medium. (claim 1 as originally filed)

Listed below in the following table is the claim language of 15 and the portion of the
specification relied upon for support.

Rejected Claim 15 Language	Support
creating a job containing medical data, medical data image viewing software,	"means for dividing the received information into one or more identifiable files for a job" Claim 1 as originally filed, Element 2 The information may be medical images such as x-rays, cat scans, magnetic resonance images, or sonograms." See abstract of the disclosure. "The Build Image Directory 75 also contains a Viewer Directory ("\Viewer) where the viewing software resides." See paragraph [0057] of the specification.
and a print file	"a means for selecting fields of identification data from the information received, for printing on the data storage medium, "a ;printer for; printing selected fields of identification data on the data storage medium and for printing other matter such as logos on the data storage medium, "a means for instructing the printer to print the selected identification data and othe matter on the data storage medium." Claim 1 as originally filed, last 3 elements
for an autoloader control software,	Buzzsaw instructs the autoloader 46 to record information on a CD and print a label for the CD. (See paragraphs [0059] and [0060] of specification.
the print file having the stored parsed	"A device for recording information on CDRs

patient identification information and the stored parsed study information	or other recording media and printing file information for observing what is recorded thereon. The information may be medical images such as x-rays, cat scans, magnetic resonance images, or sonograms. The discs can have patient names and other information selected from information stored thereon, printed on the disc as well as logos for the hospital, service provider or trademarks. The discs can be automatically loaded into the recorder and printer." See abstract of the disclosure. All the information in paragraphs [0044]-[0046] and paragraphs [0048]-[0053] are written to a file as part of the DcmBTreeParseInputDirectory. The above paragraphs are from the header of a standard DICOM File. The paragraphs refer to parsed patient information and parsed study information.

As a result of the above arguments, applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is overcome with respect to claim 15. Claims 16, 18 and 25-32 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 15. Accordingly, claims 16, 18 and 25-32 now also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement since support can be found in the specification as originally filed.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection

Claims 15-16, 18, 25-26 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wright et al. (US Patent No. 7,302,164, "Wright et al. " hereafter).

Applicant incorporates by reference the previous arguments made regarding the patentability of the claims over the Wright et al. reference. Nevertheless, Applicant has also included a 37 C.F.R. §1.131 declaration herewith to antedate Wright et al.

The 37 C.F.R. §1.131 declaration, included herewith, provides evidence of conception and actual reduction to practice prior to the February 11, 2000 effective date of the Wright et al. reference. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the Rule 131 declaration and removal of the Wright et al. reference from consideration.

The rejection of claims 15-16, 18, 25-26 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wright et al. is now moot in view of the removal of the Wright et al. reference.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection

Rejection based on Wright et al. in view of Farrell et al.

Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Farrell et al. (US Patent No. 5,717,841, "Farrell et al." hereafter). In the office action, the Examiner relied on the teachings of Wright et al. for most of the elements of these claims. The Examiner relies on Farrell et al. for its disclosure of "...a printing system and improving system performance, efficiency and speed by reducing the number of inactive jobs stored in the system memory." According to the Examiner, the "...number of inactive jobs can be reduced by causing automatic job archiving and deletion upon the occurrence of a predetermined triggering event (see column 2, lines 33-38)."

As mentioned above, Applicant has included a 37 C.F.R. §1.131 declaration herewith to antedate Wright et al. Since the Wright et al. reference is heavily relied on by the Examiner for many elements of the invention as claimed, and since the Wright et al. reference will be removed from consideration, this effectively renders moot the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Farrell et al. Of course, Applicant incorporates by reference the previous arguments made regarding the patentability of the claims over the Wright et al. reference combined with the Farrell et al. reference.

Rejection not based on Wright et al. reference

Claims 15-16, 18, 26 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelanek et al. (US Patent No. 5,724,582, "Pelanek" hereafter) in view of Kahle (US Patent No. 5,518,325, "Kahle" hereafter) and further in view of Murray et al. (US Patent No. 5,721,891, "Murray" hereafter), or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Kahle and further in view of Murray, and further in view of Wright, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Murray and further in view of Wright, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Wright.

Again, an affidavit has been filed swearing behind the Wright reference, thereby making rejections that include the Wright reference moot since it can not be relied on for its teachings or to provide any missing elements. Again, arguments made in previous office actions are incorporated by reference herein.

In order for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three base criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *M.P.E.P.* § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991)).

Claim 15 recites "... the medical data image viewing software is recorded on the disc along with the medical data and printing a template containing the stored parsed patient identification information and the stored parsed study information on the disc to label the disc." Simply put, these elements are not taught by the Pelanek reference.

The Examiner previously admitted that the feature of having the medical data viewing software recorded on the disk was not taught by Pelanek. The Examiner changed his position and now states that having a file directory on the disk is equivalent to medical data viewing software. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position that file directory on a CD (as taught by Pelanek) is equivalent to recording medical data viewing software on the disc. As set forth above, claim 15 recites recording both medical data and medical data image viewing software on the disk. Having a directory of files on the disk does not necessarily allow one to view the medical data in the files. This is what the medical data viewing software is for. For example, one could have a number of PDF files in a file directory. The PDF files can only be opened or viewed if you have a PDF reader. Without the reader, one can not view the files or see the images. The claim recites that the viewing software is recorded on the disk. Having a set of files on the disk without viewing software means that the names of the files can be read

but the medical data, including images, cannot be read unless the computer happens to have the
viewing software.

Having the names of the files (a directory of the set of files) is, simply put, not the same
as medical data viewing software on the disk. Having the file names on the disk does not allow
one to read or view the files in the absence of viewing software. Therefore, applicant submits
that Palanek does not teach having medical data viewing software recorded on the disk, as
recited in claim 15. The other references, Kahle (US Patent No. 5,518,325, and Murray et al.
(US Patent No. 5,721,891) also fail to teach having medical viewing software recorded on the
disk. None of the other references seem to teach or suggest this feature. Furthermore, none of
the references includes a motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge
generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine
reference teachings to yield this missing element.

Claim 15 also recited "… receiving medical data through a software module and parsing
patient identification information and study information from the received medical data..."
The Examiner relies on a passage at column 5, lines 42-45 of Pelanek as teaching parsing. The
passage is quoted below:

> "The user enters a patient name, ID number, etc., in to the archive station 32 by
> user input device 44, if this information cannot be supplied via the XEM motion
> image source interface 58." (see Column 5, lines 42-45 of US 5,724,582 issued
> to Pelanek)

This passage in Pelanek has been relied by the Examiner as teaching the parsing feature now
claimed by the Applicant. As noted above, parsing has a specialized meaning in computer
science. The Applicant in claim 15 is claiming a feature of analyzing or separating a received
DICOM Part 10 file into more easily processes components (i.e., parsing at least patient
information and study information from the received DICOM file). This passage in Pelanek
does not teach or describe any form of parsing to any file. As a matter of fact, a search of the
Pelanek reference on the USPTO data base found no match for the terms "parse" or "parsing"
or "extract" or "extracting". Thus, there is no teaching of parsing or extracting this information
from medical data in the Pelanek reference.

In addition, in order for a reference to be valid it must be enabling. The statement above does not teach any detail of how the XEM software would gather the data. There is no teaching of parsing, much less the details of how to accomplish the parsing, in the Pelanek reference. Applicant notes that the XEM software such as that supplied by Kodak Company of Rochester, NY (mentioned in the Pelanek reference) obviously did not have this feature. If it did, Pelanek reference would have referred to it. Thus, Pelanek does not teach or suggest "parsing patient identification information and study information from the received medical data" as now claimed in claim 15. Furthermore, there is no motivation to parse the medical data since the data is coming from a single source having a single modality (X-ray) and is for a single study on the heart that includes multiple images.

Claim 15 also recites that "… the medical data further comprising one or more files."

The Pelanek reference, in contrast, deals with storing a single file when it exceeds the capacity for a single type of media. The summary of the Pelanek reference states:

> "Where the medical image data exceeds the capacity of a single disk, the entire set of medical images is recorded as lossy compressed medical images on each disk of the plurality of disks which record the set of medical images as substantially losslessly compressed medical images." (See Column2, line 64 to Column 3, line 2 of the Pelanek reference)

Thus, Pelanek teaches a solution opposite the claimed invention…namely breaking up a single file rather than placing a file or files onto onto a media. Applicant submits that one of skill in the art of recording one or more files onto a media would not look to a reference that only writes a single file by breaking it up over multiple pieces of media.

Claim 15 also recites the element of "…noting the end of the received medical data through the software module for each patient". The Pelanek reference has no need of such a recitation. One file relates to one patient. There is no need for noting the end of the receipt of one or more files or the end of medical data received for a patient.

Kahle is directed toward an optical recording device that includes an ink jet type printer for writing a title to the disk as the disk is in and as it leaves the position where it was recorded. Kahle indicates that the

> "…recording device will have a recording chamber and a carriage for delivering and ejecting the compact disk to and from the recording chamber. **The carriage is slidable in an axial direction to deliver and eject the disk to or from the recording chamber. The printer also has a print head slidably mounted on**

the recording device over the path of the carriage. The print head is slidable
in a direction that is perpendicular to the axial travel of the carriage. **In this
manner, the visual label can be printed anywhere on the surface of the disk
as the disk is either delivered to or ejected from the recording device.**" (See
column 3, lines 3-13 of the Kahle reference)

The first embodiment of Kahle's combination recorder and printer is a device that
includes a controller that extracts title information from the data stream it sends to the recorder
portion of the combination recorder and printer.

"The transfer of digital information from the storage location 26 is controlled by
the controller 28, where a digital data stream is created which is fed to the CD
recorder 24. Interfaces between the storage location 26 and the controller 28 as
well as between the controller 28 and the CD recorder 24 for transferring the
data stream are well known in the art, e.g. SCSI. In many cases, the storage
location 26 will be part of the computer system which defines the controller 28.
That is, the present invention will frequently be used for downloading
information from an integrated computer system onto the CD-R 10. "

"In a first embodiment, a portion of the digital data stream that is
transferred to the CD recorder 24 can be extracted by the controller 28 and
delivered to a printer 30. The portion of the data stream that is extracted by the
controller 28 contains **title information** as previously described. The title
information is sent to the printer 30 to print a visual label on the CD-R 10. To
extract the portion of the digital data stream having the title information, the
controller 28 uses software available from vendors such as Bell & Howell,
Chicago, Ill." (Column 5, lines 47-66 of the Kahle reference)

Kahle defines the "title information" in the specification:

"By a visual label is meant that title information on the label is human readable
(the preferred embodiment) or machine readable (such as when the label is in
the form of a bar code). The title information will uniquely identify the
information recorded on the CD-R. **The title information can include, but is
not limited to, the name of the particular database file being recorded on
the CD-R, a brief description of the type of information recorded on the
CD-R, a table of contents, or the like.** Further, the title information can contain
information relating to distribution, mailing, filing, retrieval, security, controlled
copy number, etc." (Column 4, lines 8-16 of the Kahle reference, bolding added
for emphasis)

The title information, according to the specification, comes from the name of the database file.
There is no teaching that the extracted information comes from within any file or any portion of
any file. As a result, Kahle fails to teach or suggest that"…the stored parsed study information

16

and patient information coming from the one or more files..." as now recited in claim 1. Pelanek is of no help here since it deals with the storage of one large file over a number of media. Thus, the combination of Kahle and Pelanek still falls short of the claimed combination. There is also no motivation to combine these two references since one would not even look to Pelanek to form the invention recited in claim 1. In fact, Pelanek's teaching is so contrary to the invention as claimed so as to place it so far afield that Applicant submits one of ordinary skill in the art would combine it with any other reference to yield the invention as now claimed.

If one was to dispute that Kahle fails to teach or suggest that it fails to teach the stored parsed study information and patient information coming from the one or more files, then it is respectively submitted that the specification fails to enable parsing from the plurality of files. The specification specifies a source of software (Bell & Howell) but not the specific software. It is also extracting data from the data stream that is created in the controller. This is difficult and the specification fails to teach how this is done. There is no specification of where to begin or end. Furthermore, Kahle teaches extracting title information from a data stream being fed to the recorder. Extracting data from a data stream being fed to a recorder via SCSI would be extremely difficult and is not taught. Also Kahle suggests that data could be sent directly from the recorder to the printer which is another difficult feat with no explanation, much less an enabling one. Of course, it is well settled that a specification must be enabling to be a proper prior art reference.

The Murray reference seems to be cited by the Examiner for a timer that is used to detect a bit serial communication stream of N length. There is no need to employ Murray in either Kahle or Palenak since each handles one file at a time. Therefore, adding the timer of Murray to either Kahle or Palenak would merely be added an unneeded feature. Since neither Kahle or Palenak handle "unformatted unlimited-length serial bit streams" (Field of the Invention of Murray et al.) associated with a "communications protocol" (Field of the Invention of Murray et al.) there is no teaching or suggestion to combine these various teachings. If one were to combine these references as suggested by the Examiner, one would come up with an internal integrated media recording device that would take single files and split them up for writing to a plurality of disks or other media, and label them with file names plucked from a file directory while the CD is moved to the printing location located near the

CD writing or burning location. Murray would destroy the combination of Kahle and Palenak since it would require unformatted serial bit streams, and even if it was appropriate to combine all the references the resulting device would have a superfluous, unneeded timer.

In addition, there is no mention of patient information or study information or parsing a file's patient information or study information in any of the Pelanek, Kahle, or Murray references.

Furthermore, there is no mention in any of the Pelanek, Kahle, or Murray et al. references teaching or suggesting the printing of a template with parsed information to label the disc where the parsed information is patient identification information and study information parsed from received medical data. This is recited in the last element of claim 15.

Still further, none of the Pelanek, Kahle, or Murray references teach recording viewing software on the disk.

As a result of the above arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to make out a proper prima facia case of obviousness. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelanek et al. (US Patent No. 5,724,582) in view of Kahle (US Patent No. 5,518,325) and further in view of Murray et al. (US Patent No. 5,721,891) is overcome.

In addition, claims 16, 18, 26 and 29-32 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 15 and include the limitations of claim 15 by their dependence. Accordingly, claims 16, 18, 26 and 29-32 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelanek et al. (US Patent No. 5,724,582) in view of Kahle (US Patent No. 5,518,325) and further in view of Murray et al. (US Patent No. 5,721,891).

Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelanek in view of Kahle and further in view of Murray, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Kahle and further in view of Murray, and further in view of Wright, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Murray and further in view of Wright, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Wright as applied to claims 15 and 26 above, and further in view of Farrell.

The Examiner is reminded once again, that an affidavit has been filed swearing behind the Wright reference, thereby making rejections that include the Wright reference moot since it

can not be relied on for its teachings or to provide any missing elements. Again, arguments made in previous office actions with respect to this specific rejection are incorporated by reference herein.

The Examiner relies on Farrell for its teaching of reducing the number of inactive jobs. Claims 27-28 depend, indirectly, on claim 15. The teachings of Farrell do not cure the shortcomings of the combination of Pelanek, Kahle, and Murray et al. which are argued previously. Consequently, claims 27 and 28 also overcomes the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 27 and 28.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelanek in view of Kahle and further in view of Murray, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Kahle and further in view of Murray, and further in view of Wright, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Murray and further in view of Wright, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pelanek in view of Wright as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Koritzinsky et al. (US Patent No. 6,988,074, "Koritzinsky" hereafter).

Claim 25 also depends from claim 15. The teachings of Koritzinsky fail to cure the shortcomings of Pelanek, Kahle, and Murray et al. discussed above with respect to claim 15 and therefore claim 25 also overcomes the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 25.

As a result of all the arguments set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to make out a proper prima facia case of obviousness and that claims 15-16, 18, 26 and 29-32 now overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I should also be mentioned that Applicant incorporates all previous arguments made in previous responses by reference.

CONCLUSION

In view of these remarks, Applicants' claim is believed to be in condition for allowance. Upon entry of the above-response, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the case and an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, please also charge these fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3141.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 30, 2010   By //Richard E. Billion #32836//
                               Richard E. Billion (Reg. No. 32,836)
                               Attorney for Applicants
                               Clise, Billion & Cyr, P.A.
                               605 Highway 169 North
                               Suite 300
                               Plymouth, MN 55441
                               Phone: (763) 587-7080
                               Facsimile: (763) 587-7086

APPENDIX A

```
DATASET
| (0002,0000) : UL   Len: 4    GroupLength0002              Value: [202]
| (0002,0001) : OB   Len: 2    FileMetaInformationVersion   Value: [OW/OB Binary data]
| (0002,0002) : UI   Len: 26   MediaStorageSOPClassUID      Value: [1.2.840.10008.5.1.4.1.1.4]
| (0002,0003) : UI   Len: 54   MediaStorageSOPInstanceUID   Value: [2.16.840.1.114444.5.112608075631.6240.6960.1094100548]
| (0002,0010) : UI   Len: 20   TransferSyntaxUID            Value: [1.2.840.10008.1.2.1]
| (0002,0012) : UI   Len: 18   ImplementationClassUID       Value: [2.16.840.1.114444]
| (0002,0013) : SH   Len: 14   ImplementationVersionName    Value: [XPDSVC2.7.0.15]
| (0002,0016) : AE   Len: 8    SourceApplicationEntityTitle Value: [SORNA2K3]
| (0008,0000) : UL   Len: 4    GroupLength0008              Value: [396]
| (0008,0008) : CS   Len: 26   ImageType                    Value: [ORIGINAL\PRIMARY\UNDEFINED]
| (0008,0016) : UI   Len: 26   SOPClassUID                  Value: [1.2.840.10008.5.1.4.1.1.4]
| (0008,0018) : UI   Len: 54   SOPInstanceUID               Value: [2.16.840.1.114444.5.112608075631.6240.6960.1094100548]
| (0008,0020) : DA   Len: 8    StudyDate                    Value: [19950204]
| (0008,0021) : DA   Len: 8    SeriesDate                   Value: [19950204]
| (0008,0023) : DA   Len: 8    ContentDate                  Value: [19950204]
| (0008,0030) : TM   Len: 6    StudyTime                    Value: [101300]
| (0008,0031) : TM   Len: 6    SeriesTime                   Value: [101300]
| (0008,0033) : TM   Len: 6    ContentTime                  Value: [102203]
| (0008,0050) : SH   Len: 4    AccessionNumber              Value: [A013]
| (0008,0060) : CS   Len: 2    Modality                     Value: [MR]
| (0008,0070) : LO   Len: 14   Manufacturer                 Value: [GENESIS_SIGNA ]
| (0008,0080) : LO   Len: 16   InstitutionName              Value: [JOHNS HOPKINS 1 ]
| (0008,0090) : PN   Len: 24   ReferringPhysiciansName      Value: [Parker^Alex^Rene^^Ph.D. ]
| (0008,1010) : SH   Len: 14   StationName                  Value: [GENESIS_SIGNA ]
| (0008,1030) : LO   Len: 16   StudyDescription             Value: [Knee-left (pain)]
| (0008,103E) : LO   Len: 14   SeriesDescription            Value: [Sagittal  knee]
| (0008,1070) : PN   Len: 0    OperatorsName                Value: []
| (0010,0000) : UL   Len: 4    GroupLength0010              Value: [166]
| (0010,0010) : PN   Len: 22   PatientsName                 Value: [Impatient^Taylor^Ryan ]
| (0010,0020) : LO   Len: 8    PatientID                    Value: [7676226 ]
| (0010,0030) : DA   Len: 8    PatientsBirthDate            Value: [19620803]
| (0010,0040) : CS   Len: 2    PatientsSex                  Value: [M]
| (0010,1030) : DS   Len: 2    PatientsWeight               Value: [0 ]
| (0010,21B0) : LT   Len: 0    AdditionalPatientHistory     Value: []
| (0010,2292) : LO   Len: 0    PatientBreedDescription      Value: []
| (0010,2294) : SQ   Len: -1   BreedRegistrationSequence    Value: [SEQUENCE]
| |DATASET
| | | (0010,2295) : LO  Len: 0   BreedRegistrationNumber     Value: []
```

| | END-OF-DATASET

(0010,2297) : PN	Len: 0	ResponsiblePerson	Value: []
(0010,2299) : LO	Len: 0	ResponsibleOrganization	Value: []
(0010,4000) : LT	Len: 0	PatientComments	Value: []
(0018,0000) : UL	Len: 4	GroupLength0018	Value: [166]
(0018,0010) : LO	Len: 0	ContrastBolusAgent	Value: []
(0018,0015) : CS	Len: 0	BodyPartExamined	Value: []
(0018,0020) : CS	Len: 2	ScanningSequence	Value: [SE]
(0018,0021) : CS	Len: 0	SequenceVariant	Value: []
(0018,0022) : CS	Len: 0	ScanOptions	Value: []
(0018,0023) : CS	Len: 0	MRAcquisitionType	Value: []
(0018,0050) : DS	Len: 4	SliceThickness	Value: [0000]
(0018,0080) : DS	Len: 12	RepetitionTime	Value: [4600.000000]
(0018,0081) : DS	Len: 10	EchoTime	Value: [19.000000]
(0018,0082) : DS	Len: 8	InversionTime	Value: [0.000000]
(0018,0087) : DS	Len: 6	MagneticFieldStrength	Value: [15000]
(0018,0091) : IS	Len: 0	EchoTrainLength	Value: []
(0018,1060) : DS	Len: 8	TriggerTime	Value: [0.000000]
(0018,5100) : CS	Len: 4	PatientPosition	Value: [FFS]
(0020,0000) : UL	Len: 4	GroupLength0020	Value: [378]
(0020,000D) : UI	Len: 52	StudyInstanceUID	Value: [2.16.840.1.114444.5.112608075631.6240.6960.323572620]
(0020,000E) : UI	Len: 52	SeriesInstanceUID	Value: [2.16.840.1.114444.5.112608075631.6240.6960.323572620]
(0020,0010) : SH	Len: 6	StudyID	Value: [S1051]
(0020,0011) : IS	Len: 4	SeriesNumber	Value: [102]
(0020,0012) : IS	Len: 2	AcquisitionNumber	Value: [1]
(0020,0013) : IS	Len: 2	InstanceNumber	Value: [1]
(0020,0020) : CS	Len: 4	PatientOrientation	Value: [PVF]
(0020,0032) : DS	Len: 30	ImagePositionPatient	Value: [51.000000\-80.000000\65.000000]
(0020,0037) : DS	Len: 54	ImageOrientationPatient	Value: [0.000000\1.000000\0.000000\0.000000\0.000000\-1.000000]
(0020,0052) : UI	Len: 48	FrameOfReferenceUID	Value: [1.2.840.113619.2.1.1.322988386.473.791894491.621]
(0020,0060) : CS	Len: 0	Laterality	Value: []
(0020,1040) : LO	Len: 2	PositionReferenceIndicator	Value: [KN]
(0020,1041) : DS	Len: 10	SliceLocation	Value: [-51.000000]
(0020,4000) : LT	Len: 0	ImageComments	Value: []
(0028,0000) : UL	Len: 4	GroupLength0028	Value: [200]
(0028,0002) : US	Len: 2	SamplesPerPixel	Value: [1]
(0028,0004) : CS	Len: 12	PhotometricInterpretation	Value: [MONOCHROME2]
(0028,0010) : US	Len: 2	Rows	Value: [256]
(0028,0011) : US	Len: 2	Columns	Value: [256]

| (0028,0030) : DS | Len: 18 | PixelSpacing | Value: [0.625000\0.625000]
| (0028,0100) : US | Len: 2 | BitsAllocated | Value: [16]
| (0028,0101) : US | Len: 2 | BitsStored | Value: [16]
| (0028,0102) : US | Len: 2 | HighBit | Value: [15]
| (0028,0103) : US | Len: 2 | PixelRepresentation | Value: [0]
| (0028,0106) : US | Len: 2 | SmallestImagePixelValue | Value: [0]
| (0028,0107) : US | Len: 2 | LargestImagePixelValue | Value: [1941]
| (0028,0108) : US | Len: 2 | SmallestPixelValueInSeries | Value: [0]
| (0028,0109) : US | Len: 2 | LargestPixelValueInSeries | Value: [2693]
| (0028,1050) : DS | Len: 4 | WindowCenter | Value: [581]
| (0028,1051) : DS | Len: 4 | WindowWidth | Value: [1549]
| (0028,1052) : DS | Len: 2 | RescaleIntercept | Value: [0]
| (0028,1053) : DS | Len: 2 | RescaleSlope | Value: [1]
| (0040,0000) : UL | Len: 4 | GroupLength0040 | Value: [38]
| (0040,0244) : DA | Len: 8 | PerformedProcedureStepStartDate Value: [17530101]
| (0040,0245) : TM | Len: 6 | PerformedProcedureStepStartTime Value: [000000]
| (0040,0254) : LO | Len: 0 | PerformedProcedureStepDescription Value: []
| (7FE0,0000) : UL | Len: 4 | GroupLength7FE0 | Value: [131084]
| (7FE0,0010) : OW | Len: 131072 PixelData | Value: [OW/OB Binary data]
END-OF-DATASET